

Serial No. 09/921,438

Page 7

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 3, 2003, wherein Claims 1, 2 and 6-12 were rejected and Claims 3-5 and 13-20 were objected to. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 6 have been amended and Claim 3 has been cancelled. 1, 2, and 4-20 remain pending.

Objection to the specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as not supporting the claimed subject matter of Claim 13. Applicants have previously amended the specification to include the subject matter of Claim 13, no new matter has been added. The Examiner stated on page 2 of the Office Action that "By inserting the new paragraph in the specification, it is unclear what the applicants is trying to convey. The insertion does not read smoothly into the specification."

Applicants respectfully assert that they are responding to the objection to the specification. The Examiner objected to the specification as not supporting Claim 13. Applicants amended the specification to recite the claim elements of Claim 13, all of which are self-explanatory. The new paragraph describes the internal combustion engine as including an intake manifold for providing air to the internal combustion engine; a throttle plate controlling the flow of the air; a fuel injector introducing fuel into the air to form an air fuel mixture; at least one piston for combusting the air fuel mixture; a plurality of valves to control intake and exhaust of the at least one piston; a first camshaft having a plurality of lobes to actuate the exhaust valves; a sprocket coupled to the first cam shaft to drive the first cam shaft; a crankshaft to drive the sprocket. These terms are well known in the art and have meanings that are self-evident. Applicants have complied with 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Furthermore, Applicants are not familiar with a law, rule, or regulation that allows the Examiner to object to a specification based on how smoothly it reads. Applicants request that the Examiner provide support for the Examiner's objection to the specification.

Serial No. 09/921,438
Page 8

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102


On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 6-12 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 4, 5, and 6 to include the subject matter which the Examiner has indicated as being in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The entire Office Action dated September 3, 2003 has been carefully reviewed, and this response is submitted as being fully responsive thereto. In view of the preceding remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1,2, and 4-20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request such action at the Examiner's earliest convenience. If the Examiner believes that personal contact would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is requested to call the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

If for some reason a fee needs to be paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for the fees, which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher DeVries - Attorney
Reg. No. 44,654
Telephone: 313-665-4969

CD:sh